DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 218 SP 007 415

AUTHOR Cangemi, Joseph P.; And Others
TITLE The Impact of a Six Week Instructional Package on the Leadership Characteristics of a Group of College Junior and Senior Level Education Majors.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Tests; *College Students; *Schedule Modules; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Thirty junior- and senior-level college students enrolled in a teacher education program at Indiana University were administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule prior to the introduction of a newly developed instructional package geared to enhance the leadership behavior of teachers. The subjects participated in an instructional module, "Strategies of Teaching," for 6 weeks. The Edwards Schedule was administered again as a posttest at the conclusion of the module. Results indicated that the module was successful in significantly modifying the behavior of the subjects (as measured by Edwards) on the following traits: achievement, deference, abasement, and aggression. No significant differences were found among the posttest scores on the scales measuring autonomy, intraception, succorance, and dominance. (Author/JB)

ED 083218

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE IMPACT OF A SIX WEEK INSTRUCTIONAL PACKAGE ON THE LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF A GROUP OF COLLEGE JUNIOR AND SENIOR LEVEL EDUCATION MAJORS*

by

Joseph P. Cangemi
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Eugene Harryman
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Donald L. Coan
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Purpose of the Study

Educators are looked upon as leaders, particularly leaders of change and progress. This perception may not be accurately founded. Too many graduates of teacher education programs, once they enter school systems, seem to become more like those already in the systems, rather than prepared to establish themselves as leaders.

Why should we expect teacher education majors to become school and community leaders once they graduate if they received no such specific training in their college programs? Considerable research indicates that leaders are made, not born. Yet we make no effort at the undergraduate level to instruct students on the art of successful leadership; nor do we deliberately expose them to such material as the characteristics of successful leaders.

Is it not possible to present to teacher education majors information that can help them prepare for leadership roles both in their classrooms and in their communities? Is it not possible to prepare instructional modules or packages that can be effective in a short period of

*The authors would like to thank Thomas Kesler, Chemistry Department, Indiana University, for his assistance with this article.

SP 007 415

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

time for the sole purpose of exposing students to pertinent data on leadership roles and characteristics?

It is the author's contention that a short-term instructional package or module can be developed which can have significant impact on students regarding those characteristics considered essential to good leadership. As stated previously, many of the characteristics associated with successful leadership can be learned. Among them are wisdom, emotional maturity and stability, conscientiousness, alertness, perseverence, enthusiasm, common sense, good judgment, and willingness to assume responsibility and make decisions (Hanawalt, 1943; Hanawalt, 1944; Hollingworth, 1926; Cattell, 1946; Ghisilli, 1968; Slocum, 1971; McGregor, 1967).

Theoretically, it appears that specific characteristics associated with leadership can be taught in the classroom situation at the undergraduate level. It is the synthesis of the opinions and findings of the above authors, and many others, that such a procedure indeed could have merit.

Problem to be Studied

In an effort to investigate the possibility of producing change through instructional techniques in a short period of time, a six week instructional package was designed to enhance teacher-leadership characteristics of junior-senior level college students who intend to teach.

Methodology and Procedures

The sample was composed of 30 junior and senior level college students enrolled in a teacher education program at Indiana University.

Specifically, they were participants in a course entitled Human Development and Learning. The course was taught by one of the authors.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (1953) was administered as a pre test to the subjects in the fall of 1972. A module specifically prepared by the author entitled Strategies of Teaching was presented to the subjects. The module, or instructional package, as it will be called alternately, was presented for 6 consecutive weeks early in the fall semester 1972. The class met for a total of five hours per week; 105 minutes two days per week and 45 minutes one day per week.

The focus of the module was to develop teacher-leadership behavior. The module consisted of an exploration of the behavior of mentally healthy teachers, an exposition of the characteristics of unseccessful teachers, actual observance in the schools of teacher-leadership behavior displayed by practicing teachers, micro teaching experience--including experience on video tape with instant feedback, small group interaction without video tape, lectures and discussions on teacher behavior, a self-report inventory from each student on his strengths and weaknesses as a future teacher-leader, enhancement of the self-concept of students through different teaching methodologies, and a focus on teaching styles as indicative of certain personality patterns.

The instrument selected to measure leadership behavior was the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Of the 15 needs measured by the Edwards, eight were selected because of their significance in leadership roles. These eight needs are: Achievement, Autonomy, Intraception, Deference, Succorance, Dominance, Abasement, and Aggression. A leader has to establish goals, hence the Achievement scale was selected to measure the strength of this need possessed by the subjects. Leaders

are not individuals whose natural inclination is to "give in" or defer; therefore the Deference scale was utilized to determine the strength of this characteristic. The Autonomy scale was selected because it measures freedom, especially freedom to choose alternatives and make decisions. The Intraception scale measures analytical and introspective ability, particularly the ability to determine the motives of oneself and others, therefore it was chosen. The Succorance scale indicates the need for support and sympathy, and as a result it was utilized. Too high a need for Succorance could be detrimental to leadership. The Dominance scale measures the need for responsibility, authority, and influence and was selected. The Abasement scale identifies the strength of the need to feel guilty over one's actions and was considered important enough for inclusion. The Aggression scale measures the need to express how one reacts toward others and was selected. These needs are all concerned with leader behavior; they were all considered important to leadership and hence were selected for the study.

At the conslusion of the module, the Edwards was administered as a post test. The differences between the pre test and post test means of the eight needs measured were analyzed by the "t" test for correlated or dependent scores (McCall, 1970).

The null hypotheses being tested were:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Achievement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

2. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Deference scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

3. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Autonomy scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

4. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Intraception scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

5. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Succorance scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

6. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Dominance scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

7. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Abasement scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

8. There is no significant difference between the mean ($\bar{X}$) pre test and post test performance on the Aggression scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Results

The sample means were computed on the pre test and post test results of each of the eight scales of the Edwards considered appropriate to teacher-leadership behavior: Achievement, Deference, Autonomy, Intraception, Succorance, Dominance, Abasement, Aggression.

The formula used in computing the "t" ratios for dependent groups was from McCall (1970). The results are found in Table 1.

A Comparison of Pre Test and Post Test Means on Each of Eight Traits Associated with Leadership Behavior in a Group of Junior-Senior Level Teacher Education Majors*

	Achievement	Deference	Autonomy	Intraception	Succorance	Dominance	Abasement	Aggression
Pre test $\bar{X}$	41.9	45.4	53.0	55.5	72.8	38.0	61.8	42.3
Post test $\bar{X}$	47.0	37.6	52.1	55.3	66.2	36.8	52.2	52.0
"t"	+1.6****	-1.7***	-.2	-.1	-1.2	-.3	-1.9***	+2.3**

* One tailed test
** Significant at the .03 level
*** Significant at the .05 level
**** Significant at the .10 level

The difference in pre test and post test mean scores on the scales of Autonomy, Intraception, Succorance, and Dominance was not significant. The difference in pre test and post test mean scores on the remaining scales was significant: Achievement at the .10 level, Deference and Abasement at the .05 level, and Aggression at the .03 level.

Conclusions

The difference in the pre-test and the post-test means on the Achievement scale was significant at the .10 level and in the expected direction. It appears that as a result of the instructional module the subjects improved in their ability to establish more clear educational and vocational goals, purposes, and objectives. There was a significant decrease in the pre test and post test mean scores on the

Deference scale, and this difference was significant at the .05 level. The decrease observed was in the expected direction. This suggests that the module helped the subjects become more individualistic, less compromising, and less deferent in their behavior. There was a decrease in the expected direction in the Abasement scale pre test and post test mean scores, and this difference was significant at the .05 level, suggesting that the module assisted the subjects in feeling less guilty about their behavior, as well as blaming themselves less when things go wrong. The pre test and post test mean scores of the Aggression scale relected a difference, and this difference was in the expected direction and was significant at the .03 level. This suggests that the module helped the subjects become more expressive, less inhibited and constricted.

The data failed to support the contention that the module was effective in producing significant change in the pre test and post test mean scores of the following scales: Autonomy, Intraception, Succorance, Dominance. These traits appear to be more ingrained in the personality of the subjects and more resistant to change over a short period of time. They are apparently more central and integral to an individual's personality, are the product of complex variables, and are less susceptible to modification from the module.

In conclusion, the results of the study lend support to the belief that specific, short term instructional modules or packages potentially can be successful in developing those behaviors in students considered to be crucial for educational development. The package that the authors

sought to investigate was one concerned with the development of teacher-leadership behavior.

It is recommended that additional research in the development of leadership characteristics be initiated by teacher training institutions and school districts with specific consideration for controls affecting the internal validity without losing sight of the need for retaining acceptable external validity.

Summary

A group of one of the author's students was administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule prior to the introduction of a newly developed instructional package geared to enhance teacher-leadership behavior. The module-package lasted for a six week sequence. The Edwards was administered as a post test at the conclusion of the module. The results indicated that the module was successful in significantly modifying the behavior of the subjects (as measured by the Edwards) on the following traits: Achievement, Deference, Abasement, and Aggression. No significant difference was found between the means of the pre test and post test scores on the following scales: Autonomy, Intraception, Succorance, and Dominance.

References

Cattell, R. B. (1946), Description and Measurement of Personality, World Book, New York.

Edwards, Allen L. (1953), Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, New York: Psychological Corporation.

Ghisilli, Edwin E. (1968), 'Some motivational factors in the success of managers,' Personnel Psychology, vol. 21, 431-440.

Hanawalt, N. G., Richardson, H. M., and Hamilton, R. J. (1943), 'Leadership as related to Bernreuter personality measures: II. An item analysis of responses of college leaders and non-leaders,' Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 17, 251-267.

Hanawalt, N. G., and Richardson, H. M. (1944), 'Leadership as related to the Bernreuter personality measures: IV. An item analysis of responses of adult leaders and non-leaders, 'Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 28, 297-411.

Hollingworth, L. S. (1926), Gifted Children, Macmillan.

McCall, Robert (1970), Fundamental Statistics for Psychology, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

McGregor, Douglas (1967), The Professional Manager, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Slocum, John W., Jr. (1971), 'Motivation in managerial levels: relationship of need satisfaction to job performance,' Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 55, no. 4, 312-316.